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The East Baths At Aperlae

R.L. VANN-R.L. HOHLENFELDER-K. SHEDRICK*

Introduction

The mountainous territory of Lycia occupies the southwestern portion of Asia Minor (Fig. 1). This rugged terrain and Lycia’s position along the strategic coastline of one of the ancient world’s busiest sea-lanes enabled this corner of ancient Anatolia to be isolated from its neighbors, especially by overland routes. But at the same time Lycia remained in easy contact with distant places and their influences by sea trade. The town of Aperlae, located along the central coast of this region, was a perfect example of this dichotomy of regional isolation and contact through wider patterns of trade.

This article concerns the topic of architectural style as a product of this regional character. According to Farrington, the sources of the typical Roman bath plan in Lycia are to be found not in the neighboring territories of Pamphylia, Pisidia, Caria, or even Ionia. Rather, the closest parallels to the imperial baths of Lycia originated in the late Republican baths in Italy, best illustrated by the Stabian Baths and the Forum Baths at Pompeii or the Forum Baths at Herculaneum. In his study of the baths of this region, Farrington identifies 32 possible examples and provides detailed analysis of 20 of the better-preserved buildings. There are 9 additional plans of structures that are less well preserved or are based in on previous drawings of buildings that have now totally disappeared. Others are known only through epigraphical evidence including another 22 that mention gymnasium that may or may not be included in bath complexes. In all, Farrington lists 67 possible baths or gymnasium in Lycia. Of this number only one is listed in Aperlae and that was an epigraphical reference to a gymnasiun. Farrington appears not to have visited the site, stating that there were “considerable remains at Aperlae, but they are underwater and thus uninvestigated.” There are, in fact, two additional baths that can now be added to Farrington’s catalog.

---

* R.L. Vann, School of Architecture, University of Maryland, USA. R.L. Hohlfelder, Department of History, University of Colorado, USA. K. Shedrick, The Madeira School, McLean, USA.
3 IGR 3 No. 692.
4 Farrington op. cit. (supra n.2) 78, 97 citing Bean.
Aperlae in Lycia

Aperlae is in a remote area of the Turkish coast, still inaccessible by road in the early 21st century and available only to those who sail in or hike across the isthmus from Kekova or over the mountains from ancient Apollonia (village of Kılıç). Perhaps it was because of this isolation and the unfavorable harbor conditions, that most of the early European travelers bypassed the site. Of the few travelers who mentioned Aperlae, most sailed into Kekova and anchored there before crossing the isthmus. Although several of its inscriptions were published and a brief description provided by Bean, Aperlae remained little known and continued to be mis-identified\(^5\). It was not until 1978 that the site was reintroduced to the scholarly world by Robert Carter who published sketch plans of the city and of its submerged features along the ancient shoreline in an article focusing on the underwater remains\(^6\). Later contributions appeared by Foss and Zimmermann\(^7\).

The original town was situated on the south slope of a hill overlooking Asar Bay beyond to the ridge of Sicakyanmadasi. The original fortifications defended a steep ravine to the west, stood on a gentle rise to the north, and along a distinct vertical escarpment along the south. Only the eastern wall seems to have been located independent of a significant topographical feature. At a later date, a large portion of the south wall was dismantled. This event may or may not have coincided with the construction of a Lower East City Wall (Fig. 3) and a Lower West City Wall. The two bath complexes are located along the modern shoreline. The first, the East Baths, are outside the walls and the second, the West Baths, are found within the later, lower walled city.

A systematic survey of the preserved architectural features at Aperlae began in 1996 as a continuation of the University of Maryland survey of ancient harbors in Turkey (Fig. 2). Because of the size of the site and the number of well-preserved structures the team was expanded to include a team from the University of Colorado directed by R.L. Hohlfelder. During the four field seasons we have divided our responsibilities between the land and the sea. Hohlfelder and his students have recorded the submerged monuments while students from the University of Maryland have had the primary responsibility of structures on land. Buildings on the edge, specifically the two baths, have been a shared concern\(^8\). Work on the two baths has progressed on an intermittent schedule. During the initial season in 1996 sketch plans were made of both buildings and added to the master urban plan\(^9\). In 1997 P. Miller of the School of Architecture, University of Maryland initiated a

---


\(^8\) Over the past four years several other staff members have shared in these responsibilities. We owe a debt of gratitude to D. Sullivan from Department of Geography, University of Denver who primary task has been a survey of surrounding countryside but whose advice has always been sought for a broad range of questions on the site. J. Busko, graduate student from James Mason University has been especially helpful with the study of the water system (cisterns) within the city, and B. Leadbetter from School of Social and Cultural Studies, Edith Cowan University (Perth, AU) is currently studying the epigraphical evidence.

detailed analysis of the East Baths and directed some brush removal around the West Baths in order to complete a more accurate plan of its remains. Work resumed in the East Baths in 2000 under the direction of K. Shedrick. The detailed analysis of the building’s structure was completed and several eastern rooms were completely cleared of brush adding new details to the final plan.

The Typical Lycian Bath

In his extensive study of Roman baths in Lycia, Farrington defines the typical bath of the imperial period in that region. Lycian baths began to appear as early as the mid-1st century AD after the region was officially made part of the Roman Empire.

The baths are mostly of modest size, ranging in area from 250 to 1000 square meters. Overall plans are generally rectangular, consisting internally of a series of long rooms with their axes parallel. The baths at Apollonia, the South baths of Arykanda, and the Baths of Vespasian at Cadyanda are clear examples of this type. These rooms are entered along their cross-axis through the flank walls and correspond to the so-called row type of bath plan developed by Krencker and Kruger in their study of the baths at Trier. The sequence through rooms of varying temperatures from apodyterium, to frigidarium, to tepidarium, to caldarium is characteristically a straight line but on occasion internal turns might be necessary. Because of the modest size of many of these buildings, it is very common to find the first room serving as both the apodyterium as well as the frigidarium as seen in Baths ZB/ZC in Phaselis, South Baths at Arykanda, and the Baths of Vespasian at Patara.

A transverse room is often included that will connect to several or all in the row of rectangular rooms. Examples are seen in the baths at Idebessus, Baths MI 1 at Oenoanda, the Brick Baths at Myra, the baths at Pinara, Baths A at Tlos. Some of the larger baths include a second suite of rooms set aside by side. These suites are often at right angles to the original structure and may, in fact, be an extension to the earlier building that shares a common heating installation. Farrington groups the single room and the suite of rooms together and identifies them as a ‘row arrangement with a transverse element’ compared to others for which he retains the Krencker-Kruger identification as simple row type. I would think that additional investigation might indicate that the single transverse rooms were more often part of the original construction in contrast to suites of rooms that were added later.

---

11 Farrington does not provide detailed information about ground areas (see his bar graph in Farrington op. cit. 11). One of the major deterrents is the fact that many of these plans are incomplete but for the fifteen baths represented on the chart, one can only make an approximation of its area. The largest indicated are the East Baths at Xanthus (c. 900 sq m which apparently does not include the palaestra see ibid., Fig. 12). On the other hand the South Baths at Arykanda are clearly larger, even if you include only the earlier phase presumably nos 1-5 but not including nos. 6, 7.
12 Farrington op. cit. (supra n.2) Figs. 1-3.
13 D. Krencker-E. Kruger, Die Trierer Kaiserthermen (1929).
14 Farrington op. cit. (supra n.2) Figs. 2, 13, 17.
15 Ibid. Figs. 5-8, 10.
16 Ibid. 3.
Variety within each building is offered through the introduction of apsidal features, usually on the short ends of the rectangular rooms but on occasion along the long flank walls. Examples of a full apse in a short wall can be seen in the South Baths at Ancyra, the North Baths at Patara, and in the Baths B at Tlos. Other examples include small apses, still within the short walls, that do not fill the width of those walls. An apse in the south (mislabeled north) wall of room 3 in the baths at Apollonia, another in room 3 in Baths M 1 at Oenoanda, and a third in room 5 of the baths at Rhodiapolis are all examples of this 'small apse' type. A third type of apse is found along the flank wall of one of the larger rectangular rooms. Examples are seen in room 3 of Baths ZB/ZC at Phaselis and in the baths of Sidyma.

Several examples include a rectangular room subdivided by an internal wall. In some instances these internal divisions were bonded to adjacent walls and must have been original features while others were abutted to neighboring walls and were clearly added later. In the baths at Apollonia and the South Baths at Ancyra this cross wall appears to be an original feature but in the baths at Cadyanda, the Baths of Antoninus Pius at Cyaneae, and those at Idefessus the walls are later additions.

Farrington defines the orientation of the building according to the direction faced by the short walls of the internal rectangular rooms. It is in the short walls, beneath the vaulted roofs, that one can open the room with windows. A southern or southwestern orientation would be most logical to take advantage of the full effect of the afternoon sun. Eighteen Lycian examples are oriented to this quadrant, but at least four are oriented northwest and four others face east or northeast.

The East Baths At Aperlae

The East Baths at Aperlae are located along the shoreline some 55 m east of the Lower East City Gate (Fig. 3-5). It is important to remember that this was not the original relationship with the sea. Due to the local subsidence of land and the inundation of what was once Aperlae's waterfront, the bath building must have originally been located some 35 m inland. Immediately east of the bath a row of sarcophagi suggested that there might have been a path or street leading directly up the hill. It is still along this path that the modern visitor proceeds toward a stretch of rock-cut steps leading from the lower level of the Eastern Necropolis to the upper level and the approach to the East City Gate. A level area north of the baths and west of this path is in a convenient location for a palaestra. There are problems however. Although some of the sarcophagi north of this open area stand directly on sloping bedrock, the level area has probably been created by more recent deposits of fill that have washed down the hillside. In fact the threshold of a small door in the northwest corner of Room 1 opening out to this area is 1.60 m below the modern ground level of the so-called palaestra.

---

17 Ibid. Figs. 2, 18, 20.
18 Ibid. Figs. 1, 6, 9.
19 Ibid. Figs. 13, 14.
20 Ibid. Figs. 1-5.
21 See chart on ibid. 13.
22 This opening is clear from inside the building but is buried on the exterior.
Numerous sarcophagi along the water’s edge from the East Baths to the eastern head of the bay has been identified by B. Leadbetter as the earliest necropolis of the city and distinct from the many other tombs of the hillside Eastern Necropolis. Finally, the area west and northwest of the East Baths is covered with an almost impenetrable thick brush, which hinders any clearer understanding of the immediate surroundings of the baths. A careful visual survey in the water south of the baths has been carried out by the team of snorkelers from the University of Colorado. There is no evidence of additional walls or drains that might belong to part of the East Baths. Rather than imagining our bathers enjoying this beautiful seaside situation, it is important to remember, that because of the local subsidence of the land, the ancient shoreline was farther south.

The Plan

The plan of the East Baths at Aperlae closely follows that of the typical Lycian bath defined by Farrington. The building consisted of a range of five parallel rooms organized along an east-west axis with another room in the northeast corner and a cistern in the southeast corner (Fig. 3). The baths clearly faced west and were entered by two monumental doors in the west wall of Room 1. The doors were not equally spaced in the wall. The smaller of the two doors was closer to the north end of the wall and the larger of the two, more centrally located (Fig. 7). There is no evidence of any walls or bases on the ground west of the building but the dense brush makes it difficult to rule out the possibility of discovery of additional information in the future. There is evidence of a spur of masonry bonded to and protruding from the northwest corner of the building in a westerly direction. Was this part of a wall that defined the north end of a porch or portico to the front (west facade) the baths? If so, it might be related to the series of cuttings in the west face of this wall above the level of the doorframes. Although the spacing of these cuttings is not consistent across the entire west face of the building, they are of a size and in a position to suggest the support of an internal roof over an exterior portico.

A western entrance would dictate that the circulation through the baths, if following the standard row type arrangement, would be from west to east and then returning from east to west. Such an arrangement leaves the hot rooms of the bath (tepidarium and caldarium) located in the central and eastern portions of the building. This is not consistent with the standard Roman practice of orienting the caldarium or hot room to the south or west in order to take advantage of the heat gain from the afternoon sun. However, the arrangement was, as mentioned above, consistent with the orientation in the Lycian region. Room A is terminated by a full-sized apse on the north end (Fig. 6). Remains of revetment and plaster around the apse suggests that it once contained a pool. Although the walls stand 3.50 m above current ground level, it is not certain whether or not there might have been windows set higher in the portion of the wall than is not preserved. The opposite south wall of Room A is missing but clear indications of its foundations give us the full size of the room. Room A communicated into both portions of Room B (north and south) through separate doorways in the east wall, neither of which were as monumental as the two entry doors in the west wall.

\footnote{Although there are abundant remains of inundated architectural features along the ancient waterfront at Aperlae, the area south of the East Baths has proven to be unproductive. The water is less than a meter deep for some distance out from shore and the shallow seabed thoroughly scoured by winter storms. We have been more successful in the area south of the West Baths where a number of drains might suggest some association with the building on shore.}
In the absence of a small room at the entrance we are suggesting that Room A appears to have served as both the apodyterium and the frigidarium. This is a common practice among local bath buildings. According to Farrington’s survey of local bath buildings, marble revetment appeared only inside the buildings and in the unheated rooms. A careful investigation of the walls revealed revetment pins still in place in several areas but there were not sufficient numbers preserved to reconstruct a consistent pattern. If the absence of revetment might be taken for a local characteristic of an unheated room, so is the absence of any type of heating apparatus. There is no indication of either a hypocaust below the floor level or any radiating surface in the walls\(^{24}\).

Room B was divided into two separate areas by a thin wall (Fig. 8). Because this wall is bonded to both flank walls it was undoubtedly part of the original construction. In the north part of Room C four bonded piers measuring 30 x 30 cm are set in each of the four corners. At a later date a second crosswall was added inside the north room, creating a series of three separate spaces. The third wall was set as dry rubble without mortar and is assumed to be of a date after the use of this building as an operating bath\(^{25}\). The south end of the room is filled with a small apse and another shallow plunge pool. Once again it is important to remember that although some Lycian baths like those at Arykanda and Tlos (Baths B)\(^{26}\) enjoyed spectacular views down hillsides from projecting apses filled with windows, there was no guarantee for a great view over the water here in Aperlae. There were other examples of rooms with fenestration that might provide a closer parallel like those at Phaselis (Bath ZB/ZC) or Pataba (North Baths and Central Baths)\(^{27}\). Two doors connected the north and south portions of Room B to Room C and a third door led from the south part of Room C outside the building (Fig. 9). If Room A served as both apodyterium and frigidarium, it would follow that Room B was the tepidarium. Farrington suggests that the pair of smaller rooms might have been an attempt to introduce more variety into the different temperatures in different parts of the bath.

Rooms C and D were more squared than rectangular in shape\(^{28}\). Room C connects to Room D through a door in the center of the dividing wall. After further clearing of brush in Rooms C, D, and E, we are able to identify the opening between Rooms D and E as a window rather than a doorway. In other words, circulation through the building would have been consistent with the row type arrangement, entering and leaving through the

\(^{24}\) By all indications of doors and threshold blocks, the current ground level should be very close to the original floor level of Room A. Without the possibility to excavate under the current survey license, the only source of information about the subfloor condition come from the south side of the room where the wall has collapsed and the foundations are visible. There is no evidence of a hypocaust system in the walls using either lugged tiles ( tegulae hamatae or tegulae mammatae) held into position by nails or a local variant of the system using space pins.

\(^{25}\) This wall is not considered part of the bath structure and therefore not included on the plan. It is an east-west wall with its north face is just south of the door between Room A and Room B (north) and its south face just north of the door between Room B (north) and Room C.

\(^{26}\) Farrington op. cit. (supra n.2) Figs. 2, 20.

\(^{27}\) Ibid. Figs. 13, 18, 23.

\(^{28}\) Farrington’s analysis indicates that the rooms of the Lycian baths varied from square to rectangular shapes with ratios of width to length of rooms ranging from 1:1 to 1:3 (ibid. 3).
same linear arrangement of rooms rather than entering through the west door, proceeding through the baths, and exiting through the east door. This clearing operation during the 2000 season also uncovered another apse in the south wall of Room D. Rooms C and D should be heated rooms or caldaria. The ground level is higher in the eastern part of the building presumably future excavation would uncover hypocausts beneath these floors.

The eastern end of the bath appears to be the service area. Room E may in fact be an open court with the access to the furnace beneath the opening on the west side of that space which connects it to Room D. Room F may or may not be part of the bath complex. The cistern in the southeast corner of the complex presumably supplied water to the establishment but its meager capacity would fall far short of filling the needs of the average bath.

The original scheme of roofing was probably entirely of mortared rubble vaulting. Thick walls along the exterior west wall of Room A would have been sufficient to withstand the lateral thrust of a barrel vault. There was presumably a half-dome of the same material over the apse at the north end of that room. The springing line for this vault is still clear on both east and west interior flanks of the room. But at some time that vault was replaced with a timber framed ceiling and roof. There is evidence elsewhere in the building that vaulting schemes have been changed. Perhaps these changes were made necessary by earthquake damage. A thorough study of the phases of vaulting is still incomplete but we hope to answer more of these questions in our final publication of the site.

There are many more problems still to be addressed and hopefully solved concerning the East Baths. How was it supplied with water in a town without an aqueduct and with only a small cistern? What was the sequence of construction in its various phases of vaulting? Was there a relationship between the East Baths and the early inscription, which mentions a gymnasium in Aperlae? And finally, what was the relationship between the East Baths and the West Baths? Did they operate concurrently or did one replace the other?
Özet

Aperlae’ddaki Doğu Hamamları


Çalışmada öncelikle Farrington’un gruplandırması ve yorumları genel hatlarıyla sunulmuştur. Aperlae Doğu Hamamları’nın da Farrington’in belirlediği tipik Likya hamamı planına sahip olduğu belirtilmiştir (Fig. 3-5).

Yapı, doğu-batı doğrultulu beş paralel oda ile kuzeydoğu köşesinde bir başka odadan ve bir sarnıçtan oluşmaktadır. A-E arasında harflerle isimlendirilene beş odanın hangi amaçla kullanıldığı saptanmaya çalışılmış, çatının orijinalinin nasıl olduğunu ilşkin öneride bulunulmuştur.

Sonuçta, Aperlae Doğu Hamamları’nın ilerideki çalışmalarında cevap bulabileceği sorunlarına değinilmiştir: Hamamin su ihtiyacı, su kemerleri olmayan bir kente nasıl karşılanıyordu? Bunun için sadece küçük bir sarnıç mı kullanılıyordu? Doğu Hamamları’yla yazılı kaynaklarda geçen gymnasiyum arasında bir ilişki var mıydı? Doğu Hamamları’yla Batı Hamamları arasındaki bağlantı neydi?
Figure 3  Plan of the East Baths (staff)

Figure 4  Section looking north
Figure 5  General view of East Baths looking north (Boulger)

Figure 6  Monumental south door in west wall Room A looking northeast
Figure 7  Room A looking north into apsidal end (Vann)

Figure 8  Room B looking north at crosswall (Vann)

Figure 9  Center and south doors in west wall of Room B looking east (Vann)